



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

^a "Non solum unius urbis sed totius orbis erant Episcopi" (Petrus et Paulus). St. Hieron. Epist. Adversus Vigilantium.

abroad and went about everywhere preaching the Word—See Acts viii. 1, 4.

Cardinal Baronius's account of this foundation, or first creation of the Christian Churches (Annales A.D. 35, paragraphs 1, 2, and 3), is as follows:—p. 248-9.

"In the 35th year after the birth of Christ, all the Christians, except the Apostles, were compelled to leave Jerusalem on Stephen's death, when they proceeded into different countries, the most widely separated from one another. In these countries they preached the Gospel, and enabled the Apostles, in this manner, to multiply under favourable circumstances the Churches of God. For it was not only into Judea and Samaria, as Luke mentions, chap. viii., that these first Christians travelled. He also tells us most distinctly that they passed the frontiers of Palestine, and went into other countries—See Acts xi. 19. "Now, they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phœnicæ, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but the Jews only," but very successfully it would appear from verse 21, where it is said, "The hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." "We find also," continues Cardinal Baronius, "that an immense number of these first Jewish converts went into Asia, to whom Peter afterwards wrote his Epistles, inscribed to those scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. For the Jews lived far and wide, in Asia, and Africa, and even Europe, as well as within the limits of the Holy Land; and that the number of these first Christians was very great, is evident; for if any one will only calculate them, and reflect that none but the Apostles remained at Jerusalem, he will find that several thousand Christians must have been scattered over the world on that occasion."

That the Fathers believed the Church of Rome to have existed about the same period appears from what they say of the Emperor Tiberius, and his differences with the Roman Senate respecting it. Tiberius died in the spring of A.D. 37; and during his life the Christian Church at Rome had gained such importance and notoriety, that it is said that Tiberius actually proposed to the Senate that Jesus Christ should be worshipped among the gods of Rome.¹ If Orosius is to be believed—"The Senate not only refused this apotheosis of the Saviour, but passed a law for the expulsion of the Christian Church from Rome—which, however, Tiberius neutralized by a counter mandate, threatening death to those who should bring the necessary accusations against the members of this community—Lib. vii. c. 4.

All this, it will be remembered, is alleged to have occurred before the spring of A.D. 37, and, therefore, within two years after the dispersion of the disciples of Jerusalem, who were scattered upon Stephen's martyrdom, in A.D. 34, and while the Apostles, including St. Peter, were residing at Jerusalem, where they continued, according to the most eminent writers, including Baronius, for about twelve years, before their departure (or Exodus) out of Judea.

That this is the view taken by the early Fathers of the mode in which the Churches of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome were founded by the Apostles, is easily demonstrated; and we may give, as further illustration of what we have already said, one or two passages, in which the subject is dealt with in a very brief and explicit manner:—

St. IRENEUS, observing on the addresses of St. Peter, in the second and subsequent chapters of the Acts, says—"These are the words of that Church at Jerusalem by which EVERY OTHER CHURCH was commenced;"² and GREGORY OF NYSSÉ, who lived A.D. 390, in his sermon on St. Stephen, says—"From this time the disciples of the twelve began to traverse the whole world, and this was the beginning of the diffusion of the Gospel in all quarters; for if the Jews had not thus persecuted the first Christians after Stephen's murder, perhaps the blessings of the Gospel might have been confined to Jerusalem."³ What can more plainly show that St. Peter and the other Apostles were considered as having founded distant Churches through the instrumentality of others, rather than personally themselves.

It would be easy to multiply quotations from learned Roman Catholic writers of the highest character, to the same effect:—

"They hold," says Tillemont, "that St. Peter founded the See of Alexandria, and that he did so through the instrumentality of Mark."⁴ "If others," says Baronius, "preached at Antioch before Peter, and were thus considered to have founded the Church, Peter and Paul cannot, in that sense, be said to be its founders; but if, on the other hand, Peter is to be considered to have founded the Church of Antioch, notwithstanding that it was not he who introduced the Gospel there, Paul is certainly entitled to be considered, in this light, quite as much as Peter; for Paul did quite as much as Peter to promote that object. So that St. Ignatius, writing to the Magne-

sians, says that Paul had as much to do with the foundation of the Church at Antioch as Peter had, and that the Church of Antioch was founded by both of them.

In the same sense, and we think in no other, it is apparent that the Church at Rome was founded by both St. Peter and St. Paul.

St. Irenæus (in chap. iii. 3) speaks of the Church at Rome as that greatest and most ancient Church, known to all, which was founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Paul and Peter, but says nothing of either of them being Bishop of Rome.⁵

Dionysius of Corinth also calls it the plantation of Peter and Paul.⁶ And Epiphanius says, Peter and Paul were first at Rome both Apostles and bishops.⁷

It follows plainly, from all this, that in whatever light we view St. Peter and St. Paul, whether as Apostles or Bishops, St. Paul must be acknowledged to have had quite as much to do personally with the foundation and building up of the Church at Rome as St. Peter, except so far merely as St. Peter's addresses and conversions at Jerusalem, at the feast of Pentecost, may be considered as having originally sowed the seeds of all the most ancient Churches. We need scarcely refer to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, which he wrote long before his personal presence among them (which is clear from his speaking in that letter of the Church at Rome as a flourishing Church, and his expressly alluding to his not having yet been able to go there—ch. xv., v. 22, 24). It will, of course, be also remembered how St. Paul, subsequently, for two years sojourned there (ch. xxviii., v. 30) in his own hired house, receiving all that came unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.⁸

While, however, the personal part taken by St. Paul in building up the Church at Rome seems to have exceeded anything recorded of St. Peter (who cannot be proved even to have resided there at all), we are not to assume that St. Peter, and the eleven other Apostles with whom he was associated, did nothing to edify or advance the Church at Rome during the twelve years that they remained together at Jerusalem after the dispersion of the disciples before spoken of; on the contrary, there can be no doubt, from what St. Luke tells us in the Acts, that, as long as the Apostles remained together at Jerusalem, they occupied themselves in not only strengthening the foundations of the Roman Church, by their intercourse with the Roman converts already made, but that they also contributed to its extension and edification, by sending over, from time to time, fresh supplies of converts from the Roman Jews—either from those of them who, as Philo informs us (De Legatione ad Caium, p. 1014, Frankfort ed. 1691), repaired to Jerusalem with the proceeds of the first fruit offerings every year, or from such other Roman Jews as for any other purpose visited that city, in which, for their accommodation, there was a Roman synagogue with a school attached to it. There can be no doubt that in this way the Apostles added to that Church daily; and that not converts only, but persons whom they deputed to preach for them on their return, and to baptize for them at Rome.

There are two other passages in Irenæus which deserve attention, as bearing on this subject, and which distinctly treat St. Peter and St. Paul as equally engaged in evangelizing and founding the Christian Church at Rome, at a time too when it is clear that neither of them were there in person, and, therefore, could only have been so engaged in the manner we have already referred to.

The Greek term "evangelizing," we may premise, denotes as well instructing a Church by written documents as by oral preaching, and was indeed subsequently applied almost exclusively to written instructions. There is also another sense in which that expression is used, which we shall best explain by referring to eminent writers and critics, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant. "In the beginning of Christianity," says Father Calmet, in his Dictionary, "there were evangelists and preachers, who, without being fixed to any Church, preached wherever they were led by the Holy Spirit." "We learn from Eusebius and other writers, cited by Suicer," says Dr. Bloomfield, "that in the Apostolic Church 'evangelists' was the appellation given to those preachers who aided the labours of the Apostles, not by taking charge of any particular Church, but by acting as itinerant preachers and teachers wherever their labours might be needed, and thus building on a foundation previously laid by the Apostles."

Let us now look at the passages in Irenæus above alluded to.

¹ Irenæus, p. 175., Ben. Ed. Græbes Ed. Oxon. p. 291—"Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maxime, et antiquissimas et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ, &c., &c."

² "Τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου οὐτίαν."—Dionys. Corinth., apud. Euseb. 2, 25.

³ "Ὁν Ῥωμὴ γὰρ γεγενῆσιν πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ Ἀποστολὸι αὐτοὶ καὶ Ἐπισκοποὶ, εἰτα Αἰῶνος εἰτα Κληυτος εἰτα Κλημης συγχρονος ὡν Πέτρῳ καὶ Παυλῷ." "Etenim Romæ primi omnium Petrus et Paulus Apostoli pariter atque Episcopi fuerunt. Inde Linus, tunc Cletus. Post hunc Clemens Petri et Pauli temporum æqualis."

⁴ Epiph. Dionysius Petavius Jesuit edition, ad hæres. Lib. tom. ii., cap. 6, hæres. Carpocratiani xvii., p. 107.—Paris, 1622.

⁵ We believe Epiphanius, who was Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, A.D. 403, was the earliest writer who applies the term "Bishop" in any way to St. Peter.

"Matthew," says Irenæus (Lib. iii. c. 1.), "published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were engaged in evangelizing and founding the Christian Church at Rome. And after their departure, Mark, also the disciple and interpreter of Peter, gave us in writing what Peter made the peculiar subject of his proclamations to the dispersion."⁶

Now, the Gospel of St. Matthew was published, at latest, A.D. 41,⁷ before either St. Paul or St. Peter could have personally visited Rome; while Irenæus here states they were engaged in "evangelizing and founding" the Church there, at the date of the publication of St. Matthew's Gospel, which corroborates, in the strongest manner, our view of the matter, and proves clearly that the Apostles' presence in a city was not at all necessary to enable them to "found," "plant," "erect," or "evangelize," a Church there; which being once well understood, we shall be the less in danger of drawing unsound conclusions from similar passages in the ancient writers, who have incidentally and less distinctly alluded to the subject.

The third passage from Irenæus (Lib. iii. 3.) will require no explanation, but affords, we think, the clearest confirmation of the views we have above given. It is thus: "The blessed Apostles having founded and edified (or built) that Church (of Rome), gave the ministration of its Episcopate to Linus. This is the Linus whom Paul mentions in his Epistles to Timothy."⁸

We think we have now established, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the meaning attached by the early writers to the phrases "founding" or "evangelizing" a Church does not prove or imply that the founder had any personal, much less any exclusive, relation to it; that St. Peter was as much considered by them the founder of the other ancient Churches, at Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, as he was of that at Rome, and also that St. Paul was just as much the founder of the Church of Rome (to say the least of it) as St. Peter; and, consequently, that if St. Peter could be justly considered as Bishop of Rome, St. Paul must also be considered as Bishop of Rome, at the same period, a consequence which seems to us to establish clearly that, though both were Apostolic founders of the Church at Rome, neither of them was ever Bishop of Rome.

The third difficulty in the way of the Roman Catholic advocate, in his attempts to prove that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and held that See until his death (which is also admittedly necessary to the doctrines we are considering) is, that it seems indisputable that there were, at least, two other Bishops of Rome (if not three) successively one after another, during the lifetime of St. Peter and St. Paul—viz., Linus and Clemens, which seems absolutely inconsistent with either St. Peter or St. Paul having been themselves Bishops of Rome, though they both may have had Apostolic authority over that as well as all other Churches.

The Apostolic Constitutions (so called), a very ancient work, written, probably, in the third century, represent Linus as ordained first Bishop of Rome by St. Paul, and Clement, after the death of Linus, ordained Bishop of Rome by St. Peter.⁹

Tertullian, also, tells us that Clement was ordained by St. Peter.¹⁰

We have already seen what St. Epiphanius says upon this subject, interposing, however, another bishop, Cletus, between Linus and Clemens, expressly adding that Clemens, who followed Cletus, was contemporary with both St. Peter and St. Paul.

Irenæus also tells us that Anacletus succeeded Linus, and that Clemens, in the third place from the Apostles, obtained the Bishopric, who himself saw the Apostles, and conferred with them.¹¹

Eusebius reckons the Bishops of Rome thus—Linus (Book iii., c. 2.); Anacletus (c. 13.); Clemens (c. 15); and he says, that Clement was the third Bishop of Rome.¹²

Eusebius tells us, c. 34, that Evaristus succeeded

⁶ Græbes Ed., p. 193. Ben. Ed., 174. "Ita Mattheus in Hebræis ipsorum lingua Scripturam edidit Evangelii, cum Petrus et Paulus Romæ evangelizarent et fundarent Ecclesiam. Post vero horum excessum Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri et ipse quæ a Petro annuntiata erant, per Scripta nobis tradidit."

⁷ Father Tillemont and other Roman Catholic, as well as all the Protestant writers, assign a much earlier date to this Gospel. Baronius, with whom Calmet and Cellier agree, says it was written in the year 41. (See Annales, A.D. 41, paragraph 15).

⁸ "Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, Αἰνῶ τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργοῦσαν ἐνεχρίσαντες."

⁹ Fundantes igitur et instructes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam Linus episcopus administrans ecclesiam tradiderunt.—Irenæus Ben. Ed. 176., Græbes Ed. p. 304.

¹⁰ Τῆς δὲ Ῥωμῆς Ἐκκλησίας Αἰῶνος μὲν ὁ Κλαυδῖος πρῶτος ὑπὸ Παύλου, Κλημης δὲ μετὰ τὸν Αἰῶνος θάνατον ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου δεύτερος κεχειροτονήται.—Const. Apost. 7.

¹¹ Linus Claudius filius ecclesie Romanorum episcopus, primam a Paulo ordinatum, post mortem vero Linii Clementem, quem ego Petrus secundum ordinavi.—Apos. Con. vii., c. 47. Labbe and Com., Con. Gen. I., 452.

¹² Romanorum ecclesie Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit.—Tert. de Præscr. 32.

¹³ Irenæus Græbes Ed., 202. Ben. Ed., 176.—"tertio loco ab Apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens qui et vidit Apostolos et confabulatus cum eis."

¹⁴ ὁ Κλημης τῆς Ῥωμῆων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκκλησίας τρίτος ἐπίσκοπος καταστάς (c. 4.).

¹ The whole account will be found at length in Tertullian (Apol. v.), Eusebius (ii. 2), p. 82, and many other writers.

² "Αὐταὶ φωναὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ἐκ τῆς πᾶσα ἰσχύος ἐκκλησια τὴν ἀρχήν."

Hæ voces Ecclesie ex qua habuit omnis Ecclesia initium. Irenæus contra hæreses, lib. iii. c. 12, p. 196. Ben. ed., 1710, c. 23. Græbes, Oxon, 1702, p. 226.

³ Greg. Nyssen. Oper. Paris ed. 1573, p. 495.

⁴ His. Eccle. tou i. p. 552. Paris ed. 1693.

Clement, and, also, that Alexander obtained the fifth succession from Peter and Paul.*

Optatus gives the same succession, except that he places Clement before Anacletus.*

Rufinus, in his preface to the Recognitions of Clement, says, that it was the common opinion that Linus, Cletus, and Clemens succeeded as Bishops of Rome while St. Peter was still alive, and adds—"Some inquire how, seeing Linus and Cletus were bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, Clement himself writing to James, could say, that the See was delivered to him by Peter; whereof this reason has been given us (mark, he does not give it as his own supposition merely, but as he had it by tradition from others)—viz., that Linus and Cletus were, indeed, Bishops of Rome before Clement, while Peter was yet living—viz., that they might take the charge of the bishopric, while he, himself, fulfilled the office of the apostleship."

St. Epiphanius assigns the same reason for the appointment of Linus, Cletus, and Clemens as Bishops of Rome—viz., "Because the Apostles Peter and Paul did take journeys into other countries for preaching Christ, but the city of Rome could not be without a bishop."

St. Epiphanius tells us that Peter often visited Pontus and Bithynia, and alludes, also, to St. Paul having visited Spain.*

Cardinal Baronius goes still further, and asserts that it was the office of St. Peter, as an apostle, not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, and to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, but thoroughly to establish believers.*

St. Chrysostom shows, that the offices of Apostle and Bishop are in truth inconsistent; "the Apostles being rulers ordained by God, rulers not taking several nations and cities, but all of them in common entrusted with the whole world." Whereas, Bishops are pastors who "do sit, and are employed in one place."

Baronius also (in p. 537) enumerates the names of a variety of Churches which claim to have been planted by St. Peter or his disciples—Mauritania, Numidia, Britain, all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, &c., &c., and in another place, A.D. xxxix, p. 272, says, "How could he who had the care, not of one city only, but of all Christendom; who was bound to provide for all, to visit all, if he could, to instruct, to admonish all—in short, to feed the whole flock entrusted to him—how could he (and especially in times when the Christian faith was everywhere assailed, both by Jews and Gentiles—how could he be confined within the limits of one city, however dignified, and not rather (as St. Luke testifies he did) go round and visit all the Churches?"

What a powerful and convincing reason to satisfy any reflecting mind that St. Peter never undertook the office of Bishop of Rome—an office the duties of which he well knew were incompatible with his higher engagements as an Apostle!

We have other cogent reasons to give why we do not believe that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, but we pause here to ask whether any of our correspondents, or any other advocate of the Roman Catholic Church, will try to get over any of the three difficulties we have already suggested.

In the meantime, will our readers believe that in the foregoing article we have actually been dealing with what are usually considered by Roman Catholics as some of the strongest passages and arguments which the advocates of the Papacy have ever adduced in favour of the key-stone of their whole system—viz., the (disputed) fact that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome.

THE DOUAY BIBLE, ITS HISTORY AND AUTHORITY.

WE have already devoted several pages to the discussion of the numerous important and interesting questions connected with the Roman Catholic English Bible.* Our chief object has been to open the eyes of our Roman Catholic readers to the remarkable fact that the present Douay Bible differs from the original one in a multitude of places; and that, in the great majority of instances, the changes which have been made are corrections introduced from the Protestant authorised version. We propose in this article to add some further particulars relative to the history and authority of this famous Douay Bible.

It could have been no light cause that led to the translation of the Bible into English by Roman Catholics; for it is a recognised dogma of the Church of Rome that vernacular translations of the Bible are not necessary for the laity, and that they should not be allowed to use them without the express sanction of a bishop or priest. It is true, this fact has been often and indignantly denied by Roman Catholics; but the evidence on which it rests is too strong to be overthrown by mere assertion. It is now more than six centuries since the Council of Toulouse (A.D. 1229) made its famous 14th Canon, prohibiting the laity from possessing either the New or Old Testament; but, down to the present hour, the Vatican has never intimated its disapprobation of the sentiments expressed by that Council, or in any way declared that the Scriptures are the property of the laity as well as the clergy, and ought to be read and studied by all. It was this undisputed aversion of the ruling powers of the Church of Rome to the reading of the Scriptures that forced many writers of that communion to invent all kinds of silly and ridiculous reasons why vernacular versions should not be permitted. One of these reasons, expatiated by a learned professor at Douay, about the beginning of the 17th century, is so curious that it is worth reproducing here:—"Because," says Dr. Kellison, "Christ sanctified three tongues with the title of the Cross, to wit, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; therefore the Church would have God's Word not to be written commonly in any other tongue than one of those three sanctified tongues." In other words, because Pilate wrote the inscription on the Cross in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (in order that every one might read it), therefore the written Word of God ought to be limited to the same three languages (in order that the multitude may not be able to read it)! A hundred years later, Roman Catholics found it more prudent, when writing for Protestants, to adopt a different tone in reference to the circulation of the Scriptures. Dr. Milner, for example, thus writes in the year 1808 (*Tour in Ireland, Letter xviii.*)—"With respect to the laity, she (the Church of Rome) never interdicted the Bible to them, as Protestants suppose; but she enjoined that those who took the mysterious Book in hand should have received such a tincture of learning as to be able to read it in one or other of the learned languages, unless their pastor judged, from their good sense and good dispositions, that they would derive no mischief from reading it in the vulgar tongue. At present, however, the Catholic prelates do not think it necessary to enforce even this restriction; and, accordingly, you may find in the shops of all the principal booksellers in Ireland, Bibles in folio, in quarto, and in octavo, which are indiscriminately offered for sale with the entire approbation of those prelates." And some years later (1825), Dr. Doyle, in his examination before a committee of the House of Lords, stated—"That we have no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the possession of it by the laity of our Church, is best proved by the great many editions it has gone through in Ireland, under our express sanction; and to which editions there is prefixed a rescript of Pius VI., directed to a prelate in Italy called Martini, who had translated the Bible out of the Vulgate into the Italian language. We prefix this rescript of Pius VI. to our editions in English of the Bible, in order to show that not only we, but the head of our Church is joined with us in exhorting the faithful to read the word of God... So that, of all things said of us, there is not anything said of us more opposed to truth than that we are averse to the circulation of the Word of God."—*Phelan's Digest of Evidence*, &c., I, p. 221.

Such are the statements made by Roman Catholic divines, when speaking or writing for Protestants. But, on suitable occasions, and before fit hearers, their language is very different. Thus, the same Dr. Milner elsewhere not only admits, but justifies, the restrictions placed by his Church on the reading of Scripture:—"Substituting," he says, "the dead letter of the text for the living voice of the Church, is the ready means of undermining the Catholic

faith."—(*Suppl. Mem. of Eng. Cath.*, p. 244.) The late Mr. Sheil re-echoed the same sentiment in a speech made at Cork, in the year 1824, in the course of which he said—"There was one point which he would concede to those whom he opposed. If it were a triumph, they might have it. He would confess that reading the Bible was subversive of the Roman Catholic Church."—(*Report of the Discussions*, &c., p. 40.) Nor are these antiquated notions. Cardinal Wiseman, the highest Roman Catholic functionary in this empire, has deliberately recorded his opinion on the subject in a recent pamphlet, entitled "*The Catholic doctrine on the use of the Bible*." He thus writes (p. 20), "If, therefore, we be asked, why we do not give the Bible indifferently to all; and the shutting up (as it is called) of God's word be disdainfully thrown in our face; we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the taunt by denial, or by attempts to prove that our principles on this subject are not antagonistic to those of Protestants. They are antagonistic: and we glory in avowing it." And again (p. 26), "But though the Scriptures may be here permitted, we do not urge them on our people: we do not encourage them to read them: we do not spread them to the utmost among them: certainly not."

Such being the established and avowed sentiments of the Church of Rome respecting the circulation of the Scriptures among the laity, it could have been, as we have said, no light motive which induced such devoted adherents as the founders of the College at Douay to undertake a translation of them into English; especially at that time, when the opposition to everything having the remotest affinity with Protestant principles was most violent and determined. What, then, was this motive? It may be stated very briefly;—necessity. When the English Protestant versions made during the reign of Henry VIII. had, despite of all opposition, become so widely diffused among the people that all notion of suppressing the circulation of God's Word was abandoned as hopeless, the adherents of Rome had no other resource than to neutralize as much as possible its effect by vilifying the English Bible, and branding it with every opprobrious epithet they could invent. It was called "the Devil's Book," "the Gospel of the Devil," "the Devil's Word." But they soon began to perceive that this mode of proceeding was attended with but poor success, and that the reading of the English Bible was becoming more and more general. They accordingly were compelled to change their tactics; and, as a matter of sheer necessity, they judged it advisable to set forth a rival version of their own.

Accordingly, in the year 1582, an edition of the New Testament in English was published at Rheims, whither the College of Douay (established fourteen years before) had been temporarily transferred. This version was furnished with a copious body of annotations, fiercely polemical in their tone, and assailing in the bitterest and most abusive terms the Protestant Versions. The translation was chiefly the work of Gregory Martin. The Annotations were supplied by Cardinal Allen and Dr. Bristow.

In the Preface we are told the reasons which led to the making of the Version:—"Not upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongues, or that they ought or were ordained by God to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth and heareth them in a known language; or that they were not often, through man's malice and infirmity, pernicious and much hurtful to many, or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical and learned languages: not from these or any such like causes do we translate the sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, into which divers things are either necessary or profitable and medicinal now, that otherwise in the peace of the Church were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable." We, therefore, having compassion to see our beloved countrymen, with extreme danger of their souls, to use only such profane translations and erroneous men's mere phantasies for the pure and blessed word of truth... have set forth the New Testament, to begin withal, trusting that it may give occasion, after diligent perusal thereof, to lay away at least such impure versions as you (benign readers) have been hitherto forced to occupy." Such were the motives which induced the divines of Douay to translate the Bible into English. Their zeal does not appear to have found much favour with the heads of their Church, if we may judge from the fact that no less than twenty-seven years elapsed between the publication of the New Testament and the Old. The translation of the New Testament appeared, as we have said, at Rheims, in the year 1582. That of the Old was published at Douay 1609, 1610.¹ In the Preface to the former we are told that the translation of the whole Bible was finished, but that the Old Testament could not yet be published for want of funds. It is not likely that this cause alone would have prevented the publication for a space of nearly thirty years. It is worthy of remark that

* These epithets were applied, amongst others, by Gregory Martin, the translator of the Rheims Testament, and Matthew Kellison, whose words have been quoted above. The case of Brother John, the Mayo Monk, is fresh in the recollection of us all: vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1852.

¹ The year before the publication of the English Authorised Version.

* "ἐπιπλην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατὰ γὰρ διαδοχῇ."—Book iv., c. 1.

* Lino successit Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, Anacleto Evaristus, Evaristo Alexander, Alexandro Sixtus, &c.—Lib. ii. Dupin's Ed. p. 31. We may here observe that the learned Jesuits Labbe and Corsart, whose "*Concilia Generalia*" we have on often occasion to quote, in vol. xvi., page 130, give a list of the Bishops of Rome, in which Cletus and Anacletus are treated as distinct persons, one of whom preceded Clemens, and the other succeeded him. See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 137. Dr. Milner, also, in his End of Controversy (letter xviii., note), assumes Cletus and Anacletus to be distinct persons.

* Quidam enim requirunt quo modo, cum Linus et Cletus in urbe Roma ante Clementem huic fuerint Episcopi, ipse Clemens, ad Jacobum scribens, sibi dicat a Petro decendi Cathedram traditam, cuius rei hanc acceptum esse rationem, quod Linus et Cletus fuerint quidam ante Clementem Episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superante Petro; videlicet ut illi Episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero Apostolicus impleret officium."—Rufin., in Pref. ad Clem. Recogn.

* Πλήν ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως ἡδύνατο εἶναι περίοικτων τῶν Ἀποστόλων, φημί δὲ τῶν περὶ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, Επισκόπους ἄλλους καθίστασθαι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας πατρίδας τὴν πορείαν στέλλεσθαι, διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ δύνασθαι δὲ τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἀνεῖν Ἐπισκοπῶν ἐν αὐτῇ.—Epir. Hæres. 27, ut supra.

* Πέτρος πολλάκις Ἰόντον καὶ Βιθυνίαν ἐπισκεψάτο.—Id.—Petrus vero Pontum ac Bithyniam sæpenuvero peragravit.

* Baron. Annales, 58. Sec 51, vol. i, p. 536.

* Ἀρχοντὲς εἰσιν ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν χειροτονηθέντες οἱ Ἀπόστολοι· ἀρχοντες οὐκ ἐθνικαὶ καὶ πόλεις διαφόρους λαμβάνοντες, ἀλλὰ πάντες κοινῇ τὴν διουμένην ἐμπιστεύοντες.—Chryst. op. tom. 8, p. 115. Paris, 1838.

* Ὅτι καθήμενοι καὶ περὶ ἑνα τόπον ἡσυχάζομενοι.—Id. in Ep. d. 11, tom. 11. p. 95.

¹ Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. I., p. 42. Vol. II., pp. 49, 61, 74, Vol. IV., p. 75.

² Our materials are for the most part taken from Archdeacon Cotton's valuable work, entitled "Rheims and Douay."

³ Answer to Sulliffe, p. 157, Rheims, 1608 (the year before the publication of the Douay Bible).

⁴ As a comment on this bold statement about the abundance of Bibles, in all sizes, to be found in the bookseller's shops of Ireland, Dr. Cotton says, "I assert deliberately that, at that time, the only editions procurable were, one in large folio, published at about £4; one in 4to, published at £3 8s. 3d.; and the remnants of two Edinburgh editions, in five large 12mo. vols. the latter of which editions was advertised by Coyne of Dublin, at the price of £1 12s. 6d., in boards; a few copies on fine paper, hot-pressed, price in super-extra binding, £3 3s. 3d." Bibles at these prices, might, doubtless, be "indiscriminately offered" for sale, as Dr. Milner says; but we need hardly ask, How many copies would be bought?